

EVANGELICAL CHURCHMEN, TRUE CHURCHMEN

Church Association Tract 070

REV. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, M.A.,

Rector of Stepney

Paper read at the Autumn Conference of the Church Association,
held in the Athenaeum Room, Derby,
on the 5th and 6th November, 1878.

Whatever may be said of the present position of Evangelical churchmen, it is generally admitted that they have rendered very important services to the Church of England during the last hundred years. It is undeniable that within about forty or fifty years subsequent to the ejection of the 2,000 ministers from the Church of England in 1662, by the passing of the disastrous Act of Uniformity, spiritual religion was reduced to the most deplorable condition. One of the prevailing characteristics of the first half of the eighteenth century was the neglect of public worship; and previous to the revival of religion, which took place during the latter part of that century and the beginning of the present, the Church of England was rapidly losing her hold upon the nation.

The chief cause of this sad condition of affairs in our Church was declared at the time by Archbishop Secker to be the absence of Evangelical teaching. He wrote as follows, in 1740:—

“We have in fact lost many of our people to sectaries, by not preaching in a manner sufficiently Evangelical; and we shall neither recover them from the extravagancies into which they have run, nor keep more from going over to them, but by returning to the right way.” (Overton’s “True Churchmen.”)

We may form some idea of the losses which had been sustained by the Church when Nonconformists, at the beginning of the present century, thought themselves to be in a position to declare that:—

“some consideration at least is due to the assertion which has been made, that there are more professors of religion out of the Established Church than within its pale.” (“History of Dissenters,” by Bogue and Bennett, Vol. IV, p 341.)

But even assuming with the Nonconformist historians, who make this statement, that “the increase” of the Dissenters and Methodists “has been exaggerated beyond the reality,” still it is made evident, by the religious census of 1851, that the Established Church during the first half of this century had more than maintained its relative strength. Taking the figures as furnished in the official report of Mr. Horace Mann, and applying to these figures his own rules given in a paper read before the Statistical Society, for the purpose of ascertaining from the number present at different places of worship on the Census Sunday, the comparative number of the worshipping population belonging respectively to the Church of England and Nonconformists, we have the following result,—the Established Church had, in 1851, 42 per cent of the entire population, Nonconformists had 28, and the Roman Catholics had 5 per cent. Archbishop Secker declared, in 1740, that our Church had lost many of her people because the clergy had “not preached in a manner sufficiently Evangelical;” and that we should not “keep more from going over to Dissenters, but by returning to the right way.” This two-fold statement is undoubtedly in harmony with facts. In proportion to the absence of Evangelical teaching the Church lost ground, and in proportion to its revival the position of the Church was strengthened. These facts are undeniable whether we regard them as *consequences* or mere *coincidences*. The following statement by the late Dr. Robert Vaughan, an eminent minister and trusted leader among the Independents, more than justifies all that we assert as to the beneficial effects of the Evangelical revival. He says,—“There is one fact bearing upon our future as Nonconformists which we cannot too carefully bear in mind. Some forty years ago, the pious Episcopalian who felt the want of an Evangelical ministry, had to

go, for the most part, to the Dissenting chapel in search of it. We had large accessions to our places of worship from that circumstance. That state of things has passed away. The revival of religion in the Church of England during the last half century has been a significant fact in our history. But for that, by this time three-fourths of the people of England would have been Nonconformists. The Evangelical clergy of England, upon whom the Rationalists on one flank and the Romanizers on the other are pouring so much scorn, have saved the Church of England thus far. But, then, at what cost have they done it? Their principles as Evangelical clergymen—the very principles held by the Puritan clergymen of 1662—oblige us to look with painful feeling upon the assent and consent they profess to give.” This statement occurs in a pamphlet published in 1861, entitled “The Case of the Ejected Ministers of 1662.” I will shortly return to the last lines of this quotation, because of their bearing upon our subject; but before doing so, I will add the testimony of two impartial witnesses to the valuable services rendered to our Church by the Evangelical clergy. The late Sir James Stephens, in his Essay on the “Evangelical Succession”, wrote thus:—

“But after every allowance shall have been made for these sources of error, enough will remain to convince any impartial inquirer, that the first generation of the clergy designated as ‘Evangelical,’ were the second founders of the Church of England—that if not entitled to the praise of genius, of eloquence, or of profound learning, they were devout, sincere, and genuine men—that their doctrines of the New Testament were to them a reality, and the English liturgy a truth—that their public ministrations and their real meaning were in exact coincidence—that they rose as much—above the Hoadleian formality as above the *Marian* superstition—that they revived amongst us the spirit of Paul and of Peter, of Augustine and Boniface, of Wycliffe and Ridley, of Baxter and Howe—that they burned with a loyal and enlightened zeal for the kingdom of Christ, and for those eternal verities on which that kingdom is founded—that their personal sanctity rose to the same elevation as their theological opinions—and that in all these respects they formed a contrast, as cheering in one light as it was melancholy in another, to the spirit which, in that age, characterized their clerical brethren.” (Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography,” Edition 1875, p. 445.

Lecky, in his recently published work on the “History of England in the Eighteenth Century,” whilst, from his point of view, laying many evils at the door of the Evangelical party,—such as being the bitterest opponents of the attempt that was made in 1778 to relieve the clergy from the subscription to the Articles—resisting the opening of public museums and galleries—nevertheless bears the highest testimony to the change wrought by the labours of the Evangelical clergy. After enumerating some of their leaders, he says:—

“With much narrowness and fanaticism of judgment, with little range of learning, and no high order of intellectual power, all these possessed, in an eminent degree, the qualities of heart and mind that influence great masses of men; and they and their colleagues gradually changed the whole spirit of the English Church. They infused into it a new fire and passion of devotion, kindled a spirit of fervent philanthropy, raised up the standard of clerical duty, and completely altered the whole tone and tendency of the preaching of its ministers. Before the close of the century the Evangelical movement had become dominant in England, and it continued the almost undisputed centre of religious life till the rise of the Tractarian movement in 1830.” (Vol II, p. 627).

He says again:—

“The Evangelical movement, which directly or indirectly originated with Wesley, produced a general revival of religious feeling, which has incalculably increased the efficiency of almost every religious body in the community, while at the same time it has not seriously affected party politics. (Vol. II, p. 634).

But it will be said in reply, even granting all that has been alleged on this point to be founded on fact, it does not prove that “Evangelical churchmen are true churchmen.” Indeed, Dr. Vaughan, in the passage already quoted, whilst declaring that the Evangelical clergy have saved the Church of England thus far, adds, “but, then, at what cost have they done it? Their principles as Evangelical clergymen—the very principles held by the Puritan clergymen of 1662—oblige us to look with

painful feeling upon the assent and consent they profess to give.” Dr. Vaughan’s pamphlet consists of the speech which he delivered at the Congregational Union in 1861, in moving the resolution which recommended the Bicentenary Commemoration in the following year. The argument which underlies Dr. Vaughan’s reasoning, constituted the foundation of all the reflections which were made upon the honesty and consistency of the Evangelical clergy during the agitation throughout 1862.

These men, it was said, could not honestly subscribe the Prayer Book; the Evangelical clergy hold their views, and, therefore, they are dishonest in doing what the ejected of 1662 could not do. This would be very logical reasoning were it founded upon facts; but the premises are erroneous, and so consequently is the conclusion based upon them. The ejected ministers of 1662 were, for the most part, Presbyterians and Independents; the Evangelical clergy are Episcopalians; most of the ejected of 1662 were required, if they remained in the Church, to be re-ordained, by our Bishops; and we know that this was the chief reason why Howe and others refused to conform: the Evangelical clergy have received such ordination.

The ejected of 1662 had subscribed the Westminster Confession; the Evangelical clergy conscientiously subscribe the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Book of Common Prayer; the ejected of 1662 were required to renounce the Solemn League and Covenant, the Evangelical clergy have never subscribed it. It would be easy to add much more on this head: but the following quotations from acknowledged Dissenting authorities will show how utterly destitute of foundation is the supposed parallel between the two. The Dissenting historian, Orme, speaking of the requirements of the Act of Uniformity, says:—

“The conditions were so framed, that, independently of religious considerations, it was impossible that men of principle, who had taken an active part in the former changes, or who had approved of those changes, could submit to them. They extended to some things by an almost wanton stretch of authority, and involved a total departure from all just views of civil liberty, the cause of which must be regarded as virtually abandoned by those who submitted to them.”—(*Orme’s Life of Baxter*, p. 231.)

I will only add a second authority, quoted by the respected Independent Minister and historian, Dr. Stoughton, which shows that the statement is not true—viz., that all these 2000 ministers, or even the great majority of them, left the Church of England because they could not conscientiously subscribe the Prayer Book. The authority quoted by Dr. Stoughton is William Hook, who lived at the time, and thus expressed himself:—

“Yet some of the ministers have suffered as refusers of the abjuration of the Covenant, and as non-assenters and consenters to the present Liturgy. Had not the Covenant pinched them, very many of them would not have stuck at submitting to the Common Prayer, as is generally believed.”

The *Christian Spectator*—a Nonconformist periodical—in its April number for 1862, felt it necessary to caution Dissenters—“To be careful and precise in statements descriptive of the grounds of Nonconformity in 1862.” Adding—

We have reason to think that some curious letters from America which will appear in Mr. Stoughton’s forthcoming volume on ‘Church and State Two Hundred Years Ago,’ will prove that *the more general* occasion of Nonconformity among the Presbyterians was in their objection to abjure the oath of the *Covenant*, which abjuration was required by the Act of Uniformity.”

It will thus be seen that one reason why some of these men left the Church was because they would not submit to be re-ordained; but the chief cause why the majority did so was because they were required to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant.

By the Act of Uniformity of 1662 they were required as a condition of retaining their livings to declare in respect to their oath to the Covenant “*that the same was in itself an unlawful Oath, and*

imposed upon the subjects of this Realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom.” As honest men they could not swear one thing in 1644 and then abjure the same oath in 1662; and therefore rather than do it they gave up their livings.

I do not say that these men did not seek to obtain changes in the Book of Common Prayer: I do not say that *some* of these men did not give up their livings rather than subscribe to the Prayer Book; but I do say that *the vast majority* of them would have remained in the Church if the only thing required of them had been subscription to the Prayer Book. Having regard to these facts I have always felt profoundly astonished at the persistent way in which some Nonconformists have argued on the assumption of an almost identical parallel between the position of the ejected ministers of 1662 and the Evangelical clergy of the present day; when, as a matter of fact, the two positions are so widely different.

I.—VIEWS OF THE REFORMERS.

In support of the assertion that Evangelical churchmen are true churchmen, we allege—That in regard to the doctrines designated “Evangelical”, there exists an essential agreement between the Reformers who compiled our Liturgy and Articles and the Evangelical clergy. These are the men with whose position and sentiments it is most natural to compare the views and position of the Evangelical clergy; and by this comparison to judge their loyalty.

Who, then, gave us, to use the words of Dr. Vaughan, “that Baptismal Service, that Absolution Service, that Burial Service, that Church Catechism?” We answer that, except the last part of the Catechism, they were all compiled by the Reformers of 1552 and 1562. Surely, if any comparison is to be made, it should be—not between the Evangelical clergy of our day and the ejected ministers of 1662—but between the Evangelical clergy and those Reformers who compiled the formularies which we are required to subscribe. Here is just ground for instituting a comparison. What, then, were the theological sentiments of the men who gave us the chief part of our Prayer Book and drew up the Articles which were finally agreed upon in 1562, “for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion?” Our answer to these questions is, that these men firmly maintained the doctrines which are held by the Evangelical clergy of the present day. This is our contention; and in support of this position I will adduce authorities which, I think, will be deemed worthy of consideration.

1. I will begin with the candid statement of the Rev. W. Maskell, chaplain to the late Bishop of Exeter. He was regarded, at the time of the Gorham Controversy, before he went over to the Church of Rome, as a learned High churchman. Being led by circumstances to reconsider some of the questions at issue between High churchmen and Evangelical churchmen, he wrote thus:—

“Whatever my opinion may have been some time ago, it is impossible for me to conceal from myself that further inquiry has convinced me that the real spirit and intention of the Reformed Church of England are shown and carried out and taught by the Low Church party, as truly as by ourselves; I cannot bring myself to say rather than ourselves, but at least they have amply sufficient argument to oblige us to the acknowledgment that the very utmost which we can claim for our opinions is, that they are open to us.”

He tells us also the chief reason which produced this change of opinion. He says:—

“I was not prepared to learn, as I have learnt, that, perhaps with about two exceptions, all the divines, Bishops and Archbishops, doctors and professors, of the Elizabethan age—the age, be it remembered, of the present Common Prayer Book in its chief particulars, and of the Book of Homilies, and of the Thirty-nine Articles—held and taught doctrines inconsistent (I write advisedly) with the true doctrine of baptism.”

2. To the same effect is the following passage from the pen of Dr. Heylin, the friend and biographer of Archbishop Laud. He wrote thus:—

“It cannot be denied, but that, by the error of these times, the reputation which Calvin had attained to in both Universities, and the extreme diligence of his followers, . . . there was a general tendency unto his opinions; . . . his Book of Institutes being for the most part the foundation on which the young divines of those times did build their studies.”

Then, referring to the University of Oxford, he says:—

“Of any men who publicly opposed the Calvinian tenets in this University till after the beginning of King James’ reign, I must confess that I have hitherto found no good assurance.” (Overton’s “True Churchmen,” p. 82).

He declares that after the most careful investigation, he could only find two divines who during this period maintained other principles, and these he compares to the apparently isolated position of the Prophet Elijah in the days of King Ahab. Such are the frank acknowledgments of two eminent High Churchmen, one belonging to the nineteenth and the other to the seventeenth century.

3. As latterly the consistency of the Evangelical clergy has often been assailed by our Nonconformist brethren, my third and fourth testimonies shall be those of the eminent Nonconformists, Robert Hall and Richard Baxter.

The biographer of Robert Hall tells us that this “most distinguished of the Calvinistic Dissenters” wrote an elaborate critique in defence of the Evangelical clergy. My references are to the edition of 1858. At page 293, Vol. II, he tells us of clergymen, subsequent to the Restoration, who supplanted “the doctrines of the Reformation” by “copious and elaborate disquisitions on points of morality,” and who were succeeded by others who “improved upon their pattern by consigning the Articles of the Church to still more perfect oblivion, by losing sight still more entirely of the peculiarities of the Gospel.” At page 394, speaking of Whitfield and Wesley, he says: “Nothing was farther from the views of these excellent men than to innovate in the established religion of their country; their sole aim was to recall the people to the good old way, and to imprint the doctrine of the Articles and Homilies on the spirits of men.” At page 297, he fully describes the principles of the Evangelical clergy, and then, in the next page he writes thus: “Are the clergy styled Evangelical to be blamed for preaching these doctrines? Before this can be allowed, the Articles must be cancelled by the same authority by which they were established, &c.

4. Richard Baxter wrote a book in 1659, but two years before the final revision of the Prayer Book, entitled “Five Disputations of Church Government and Worship.” In the preface, addressed to those that adhere to Prelacy,” he writes:—“You must needs know that the Divines called Episcopal in England, are of two sorts, that very much differ from one another: And therefore supposing you to be the followers of these differing Divines, I shall accordingly further speak to you as you are.

I. The Bishops of England, and their followers from the first Reformation, begun by King Edward the Sixth, and revived by Queen Elizabeth, were sound in Doctrine, adhering to the Augustinian Method, expressed now in the Articles and Homilies: They differed not in any considerable points from those whom they called Puritans: but it was in the form of Government, and Liturgy, and Ceremonies that the difference lay.

II. But of late years a new strain of Bishops were introduced, differing much from the old, and yet pretending to adhere to the Articles and Homilies and to be Fathers of the same Church of England as the rest. I know of none before Bishop Mountague of their way, and but few that followed him, till many years after.

We have, in the passages I have cited, the testimony of two learned High churchmen, and two equally distinguished Nonconformists, all giving the most unqualified support in favour of the very important position for which we contend—viz., that the framers of the Liturgy, in its chief particulars, the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Homilies, were men who held all the doctrines which constitute the distinguishing characteristics of Evangelical Churchmen. If this position is unassailable, it surely goes a long way towards proving that “Evangelical churchmen are true churchmen,” as it is hardly conceivable that men who firmly held Evangelical truth, would frame formularies which Evangelical men could not honestly subscribe. An overwhelming amount of evidence may be produced to show that the position which we have been endeavouring to establish is impregnable. To the testimonies already cited I will add a few facts and authorities.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of some statements of Bishop Burnet which are found in his work on the Articles. It is evident from the Preface that he was in sympathy with the *Arminian* rather than the Calvinistic school of theology; yet in his exposition of the 17th Article he frankly acknowledges that the early Reformers were generally Calvinists; and whilst he contends that Arminians may with a good conscience subscribe this Article, he says, “On the other hand, the Calvinists have less occasion for scruple; since the Article does seem more plainly to favour them.” If we bear these admissions in mind, and remember his own views, and the further fact, that he wrote his work at the request of Archbishop Tillotson, we have the strongest presumptive evidence that the framers of the Articles were men who held Calvinistic opinions. But the same men who gave us the Articles, gave us also the Liturgy—at least, if not the Liturgy as it now stands, those *very portions* which, it is sometimes contended, Evangelical clergymen must find it difficult to subscribe. I do not for a moment intend to suggest that because the framers of the Articles were Calvinists, therefore none but Calvinists can honestly subscribe these Articles; but only that it is obvious that if they were Calvinists, they must have been men holding what are called “Evangelical” doctrines: for though all Evangelicals are not Calvinists, all Calvinists must be Evangelical. The following passage of Bishop Burnet, which occurs in the Preface to his work on the Articles, deserves special consideration:—

“The first, and indeed the much best writer of Queen Elizabeth’s time, was Bishop Jewel—who had so great a share in all that was done then, particularly in compiling the second Book of Homilies, that I had great reason to look on his works as a very sure commentary on our Articles, as far as they led me. From him I carried down my search through Reynolds, Humphreys, Whitaker, and the other great men of that time.”

Are ritualists prepared to accept Bishop Jewel’s works “as a very sure commentary on our Articles, as far as they lead?” So far from agreeing with Bishop Burnet in accepting bishop Jewel’s works at large for this purpose, they will not accept his Apology, though it is a book of authority in the Church of England.

The Apology received the sanction of Convocation in 1562. In this year the Thirty-nine Articles were agreed upon by Convocation; and *in a letter of Bishop Jewel* to Peter Martyr, who was at Zurich, he declared:—“As to matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrines a nail’s breadth.” These are the words of “the first and much the best writer of Queen Elizabeth’s time”—of one “who had so great a share in all that was done then.” Writing to one who was a Calvinist and a Protestant of Protestants, he tells him: “We do not differ from your doctrine a nail’s breadth.”

Among the “great men” whose writings Bishop Burnet consulted in preparing his work on the Articles, he names Dr. Whitaker, a polemical divine in Queen Elizabeth’s reign. It is said that Cardinal Bellarmine, though often foiled by Dr. Whitaker’s pen, honoured him by keeping his picture in his library, and gave as a reason for so doing, that “although he was an heretic, and his adversary, yet he was a learned adversary.” This divine writing on the subject of Calvinism, declares:—

“The Church of England, ever since the gospel was restored, hath *always* held this opinion: this, Bucer in our University, and Peter Martyr at Oxford, professed . . . this opinion their auditors in both our Universities, the bishops, deans, and other divines, who upon the advancement of our famous Queen Elizabeth to the crown, returned either from exile, or were released from their prisons: those by whom our Church was reformed, our religion established, popery thrust out, and quite destroyed: (all of which we may remember, though few of this kind by yet living) this opinion, I say, they themselves have held, and commended unto us; in this faith they have lived, in this they died, in this they always wished that we should constantly continue.” (Cygnea Cantio, page 65-66, Edition 1595, quoted from Overton’s “True Churchmen,” p. 72.

In reply to the allegation which is sometimes made that the Reformers, whilst giving us Protestant and Evangelical Articles, gave us also a semi-Romish Prayer Book, I think it will suffice to answer in the words of Crofton, a Presbyterian minister in 1662:

“I dare not charge our first reformers and Marian martyrs to have gone to the stake under the guilt and in the very act of impiety; and yet many of them went embracing, commending, chanting, and concluding their last devotion and breath in the words and order of the Common Prayer.”— (“Reformation not Separation; or, Mr. Crofton’s Plea for Common with the Church of England, 4to. 1662, quoted in Lathbury’s ‘History of the Prayer Book,’” p. 344.)

But there is a further objection which it is necessary to notice—viz., that the Prayer Book as finally revised in 1662 is far less Protestant and Evangelical than it was before. On this point, I desire to offer a few observations. I have carefully compared “The several Editions of the Book of Common Prayer” by Keeling; and have read the chapter bearing on the subject of the Revision of 1661 by Dr. Stoughton, in his book on “Church and State Two Hundred Years Ago;”—the chapter in Procter on “The Book of Common Prayer,” and the one in Lathbury’s “History of the Book of Common Prayer.” I not only fail to discover any justification for the allegation that the changes made were, as a whole, in regard to Protestantism, of a retrograde, character; but on the other hand, I can cordially endorse the statement made by Dr. Blakeney, in his invaluable work on the Prayer Book, that it “has been handed down to us, not less Protestant by the Revision of 1661, but more so than before.” Lathbury, a moderate High churchman, says:—

“After the fruitless attempts at comprehension in the Savoy Conference, the Convocation proceeded to revise the Book of Common Prayer. The bishops spent the vacation in making such alterations in the Book of Common Prayer as they thought would make it more grateful to the dissenting brethren, and such additions as in their judgment the temper of the present time and the past miscarriages required.”—(*Lathbury’s History of the Prayer Book*, p. 344.)

Lathbury repeatedly declares that “though a few things were “altered in the book, yet substantially it remained the same;” and he gives as one reason, that “the Convocation would not rashly “touch the work of the Reformers.”

I have endeavoured at some length to show that the framers of our formularies were men who held those distinctive doctrines which are designated “Evangelical;” and in support of this position I have submitted evidence from men of different schools of thought—from High churchmen, like Maskell and Heylin; Arminians, like Bishop Burnet; Evangelicals like Jewel and Whitaker; and from Non-conformists, such as Baxter and Robert Hall. I repeat what I have stated before—viz., that it is impossible to conceive that men holding firmly Evangelical truth would frame formularies which Evangelical men would be unable consistently to subscribe.

II.—STANDARD OF DOCTRINE.

There is another test by which we are willing that our Churchmanship should be judged—viz., the Doctrinal Standard of the Church of England. It seems to be a work of supererogation to prove that the Thirty-nine Articles are the Supreme Standard of doctrine in the Church of England. This is involved in the declared design of the Articles. They were “Agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562, for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true Religion.” This is confirmed by the Declaration of King Charles I, prefixed to the Articles, in which it is said that they “do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England agreeable to God’s Word.”

Thomas Rogers wrote the first exposition of the Articles in 1607. He dedicated it to Archbishop Bancroft, by whom the book was approved. In the dedication he says:—

“The purpose of our Church is best knowne by the doctrine which she doth profess; *“the Doctrine by the 39 Articles established by Act of Parliament; the Articles by the words, whereby they are expressed; and other purpose than the publike Doctrine doth minister; and other Doctrine than in the said Articles is contained, our Church neither hath, nor holdeth.”*

Bishop Burnet in the Preface to his book on the Articles, says, the Thirty-nine Articles “are the sum of our doctrine, and the confession of our faith.” Bishop Tomline declares that since 1571, “these Articles have been the criterion of the Faith of the Members of the Church of England.” Bishop Stillingfleet, speaking of the Thirty-nine Articles, writes thus:—“This we *all* say, that the Doctrine of the Church of England is contained therein; and, whatever the opinions of private persons may be, this is the standard by which the sense of our Church is to be taken!” Bishop Stillingfleet’s words express what was the view taken on the subject by churchmen generally for 150 years after the Reformation. This is the view which found expression in the “Instructions to the Missionary Clergy,” drawn up and printed by order of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in 1706. One of the bye-laws runs thus:—“That they acquaint themselves thoroughly with *the Doctrine of the Church of England*, as contained in the Articles and Homilies; its Worship and Discipline, and Rules for Behaviour of the Clergy, as contained in the Liturgy and Canons; and *that they approve themselves accordingly*, as Genuine Missionaries from this Church.”

I got a severe castigation from the *Church Times* for some remarks which I made at the Sheffield Church Congress. One of these remarks had reference to the point under consideration—viz. subscription to the Articles. The *Church Times*, says, Mr. Bardsley “insinuated that the High Church clergy did not accept the Thirty-nine Articles, because somebody once emitted a foolish joke about their being ‘forty stripes save one.’ But he is a great deal too shrewd not to know that High churchmen are the only people who really subscribe the Articles in ‘their plain and full meaning,” and in the literal and grammatical sense.

My remarks, as I distinctly concluded by saying, had no reference to what are called “High churchmen,” for though we differed from them we never questioned their loyalty, adding that we could not for a moment confound Romanizers and High churchmen. I plainly “insinuated” that Ritualists do not loyally accept the Articles, and I supported my “insinuation” by referring, amongst other things, to the fact that the Thirty-nine Articles had been called “the forty stripes save one.” This, says the *Church Times*, was “a foolish joke.” Let me say that I first met with this so-called “foolish joke” in the Essay on the “Re-union of the Church,” in the *Church and the World* for 1866. The writer (Mr. Blenkinsop) is speaking of the difficulties in the way of the re-union of Christendom; and when approaching the question of doctrine, he says:—“There remains the more important and difficult question of doctrine. First of all come the Thirty-nine Articles, those Protestant Articles tacked on to a Catholic Liturgy, those ‘forty stripes save one,’ as some have called them, laid on the back of the Anglican priesthood;—How are they to be got over?” It will be seen that Mr Blenkinsop does not treat the saying as “a foolish joke.”

The *Church Times* gives its readers to understand that the clergy of its way of thinking “are the only people who really subscribe the Articles in ‘their plain and full meaning.’ I read those words over and over again, thinking I must have mistaken their meaning; for after reading these words it is rather disappointing to read the following statement in the *Church Times* for March 12th, 1869:— “We have never seen the use of retaining the Thirty-nine Articles at all.” And again, on the 3rd of September, 1869, we read:—“The abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles, the adoption of Edward VI.’s First Communion Office. . . . would win for the Disestablished Church the respect of Christendom.”

Nor is the *Church Times* singular among Ritualistic organs in seeking to promote the abolition of the Thirty-nine Articles. In the *Church News* for July 29th, 1868, we read:—“It will soon become the duty of churchmen to labour actively for the abolition of the Articles, which have long ago done their work and are really of extremely little use now, discrediting us (as they do) in the eyes of foreign Catholics.”

The *Church Quarterly Review*, for July last, has an article on the “Dogmatic Position of the Church of England.” In this article the reader is told that, “as regards even those of the Thirty-nine Articles to-which exception is taken by Latin and Oriental divines, it is to be remembered, that their position, as defended by Archbishop Bramhall (with whom many other great theologians agree) “is only that of pious opinions, or inferior truths,” &c. These passages need no comment.

Have the Evangelical clergy ever laboured to get the Articles abolished? On the contrary, may we not ask, Who successfully resisted the attempt that was made in the last century by opponents of dogmatic theology to abolish subscription to the Articles? Lecky, in his “History of the Eighteenth Century,” says the attempt was resisted by the members of the Evangelical party. And now that a similar attempt is being made by those who are seeking to un-Protestantize our Church—to get rid of the Articles—more especially those “to which exception is being taken by Latin and Oriental divines”—do they not encounter the strongest resistance from the members of the Evangelical party? Tried, then, by this test, Who are true churchmen? They who seek to abolish the Articles, or those who defend them? Those who, in the words of the Bishop of London, attack or explain away the anti-Roman positions of the Articles of which they confess their dislike,” or those who hold to them as the sheet-anchor of their churchmanship? We believe, with Bishop Hall, that “the voice of God our Father, in His Scriptures, and (out of them) the voice of the Church our Mother, in her Articles, is that which must both guide and settle our resolutions.”

III.—AUTHORITATIVE JUDGMENTS.

There is a third test of churchmanship, to which Evangelical churchmen confidently appeal, viz., the authoritative Judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

1. The Gorham Judgment.

This Judgment shows that the views held by the Evangelical clergy on the Sacrament of Baptism are not only in harmony with the “opinions” which “have been propounded and maintained without censure or reproach, by many eminent and illustrious divines who have adorned the Church from the time when the articles were first established;” but they are also declared to be consistent with an honest interpretation of the Baptismal Services and the Thirty-nine Articles. The justice of the decision of the court is acknowledged, as we have already seen, by Mr. Maskell; and it is equally approved by Mr. Mozeley, the late Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Mr. Mozeley was a learned High churchman.

2. The Bennett Judgment.

The plain and forcible exposition of the teaching of the Church of England on the Lord’s Supper, by the Court of Appeal, can only be regarded by Evangelical churchmen with feelings of devout thankfulness to God.

The court did not, indeed, condemn Mr. Bennett, because to the majority of its members it had not been clearly proved that he held the doctrine imputed to him; therefore it cannot be said with truth that *legal* sanction is given by the court to that doctrine, when the court distinctly affirmed, both directly and indirectly, that had the accused been proved to hold it, they must have condemned him. They intimate that if Mr. Bennett had “expressly” taught that there was any presence other than *spiritual*, he must have been condemned. They also say that, “It is not lawful for a clergyman to teach that the sacrifice or offering of Christ upon the Cross, or the redemption, propitiation, or satisfaction, wrought by it, is or can be repeated in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; nor that in that ordinance there is or can be any sacrifice or offering of Christ which is efficacious in the sense in which Christ's death is efficacious, to procure the remission of the guilt or punishment of sin.” Equally distinct is the declaration of the judges on the point of adoration, viz., that the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration either to the consecrated elements, or to any corporal presence of Christ therein.

3. The Mackonochie, Purchas, and Ridsdale Judgments, secured an authoritative declaration of the law against the restoration of those Romish vestments and practices which, more than three hundred years ago, our Reformers “utterly defaced and destroyed” as “reliques and monuments of superstition and idolatry.” These Judgments have put it in the power of both the laity and our bishops to check most effectually practices which Dean Burgon declared, in a sermon at Oxford only last month, constituted nothing else than a crime, viz., the “miserable endeavour to familiarize our people with Romish dresses, Romish gestures, Romish practices, Romish phraseology, and Romish doctrines.”

Without forgetting that there are some evils which arise from the connection of Church and State, these Judgments enable us, in the language of Matthew Henry to say, “Give God praise for the establishment of religion, that the Reformation was, in our land, a national act, and that Christianity thus purified is supported by good and wholesome laws, and is twisted in with the very Constitution of our Government.”

IV.—THE TEST OF WHETHER THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IS PROTESTANT.

This is the last point to which I shall invite attention. This test, as a means of determining whether Evangelical churchmen are true churchmen has more than once been proposed by our opponents. It was thrown down as a challenge in the early years of the Tractarian movement. In an article on Archbishop (then Bishop of Chester) Sumner's Lectures on the Romans, the following passage occurs in the “British Critic” for July, 1843, p. 64:—

“It cannot be too often repeated, that if Protestantism be Christianity, Catholicism (whether *Roman* Catholicism, or Tractarianism, which has taken to itself the name of Anglo-Catholicism), is anti-Christianism, and of course *vice versa*. There never was, and there never will be, charity in softening down real distinctions; open hostilities are ever a shorter road to eventual peace than hollow and suspicious alliances.”

When Mr. Homersham Cox's recently published essay, “Is the Church of England Protestant?” was reviewed in the *Church Times*, the reviewer declared, that if the Church of England be Protestant—“then the Evangelicals are right, and all the action of the Church Association is more than justified, and also the attempt now being made by Parliament in the same interest.” We accept the challenge, and only regret that we have not time to go fully into the question; but we can, I think, in a short space indicate the outline of our argument in support of the position that the Church of England *is* Protestant.

Mr. Homersham Cox contends that if we “search the Prayer Book through we shall not find the word Protestant once used.” To this illogical reasoning we reply—that in the whole of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, we do not find the word “Trinity.” Will Mr. Cox contend that because the word Trinity is neither in the Old Testament nor in the New Testament, that the *doctrine* is not there? I suppose that Mr. Cox, if he were reasoning with a Socinian, would reply in the way I am replying to him; he would argue—“I do not say the word is there, but the doctrine is there.” And so I say, that though the word Protestant is not in the Prayer Book, we have got what is infinitely better, we have got Protestantism there. I turn to the Thirty-nine Articles, and I ask, Do they not protest against the Roman Catholic doctrine of works of supererogation—against the infallibility of General Councils, as maintained by the Church of Rome? Do they not protest against the Romish doctrines of purgatory, pardons, the worshipping and adoration as well of images as of reliques? Does not our Church say of the Romish doctrine of invocation of saints that it is “a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God?” She protests against having divine service in an unknown language; against the doctrine of seven sacraments. She says that five of them are not sacraments of the Gospel. She declares that the doctrine of transubstantiation is “repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions;” she declares that “the sacrifice of masses” involve “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” She protests against the supremacy of the Pope, both in the thirty-seventh Article and in the first of her canons. As for the homilies, they abound with protestations against the Church of Rome. One of the canons of 1604 (the 55th) requires preachers and ministers to move the people to join with them in prayer for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The Church referred to in this canon as the Church of Scotland is the Protestant Church of that country (Presbyterian), as is evident from the fact that the present Episcopalian Church of Scotland, as stated by Dean Hook, was only established in 1610, whereas the canons were framed in 1604, and we could not be required to pray for a Church that had no existence for six years after the canons were published.

There is another point to which I invite attention, viz., that throughout the whole of the seventeenth century, and indeed up to the last thirty or forty years, men of every school in our Church, even the highest churchmen, invariably called our Church the “Protestant Reformed Church of this country.” Archbishop Laud, on the scaffold just before his execution, distinctly and solemnly declared, with his dying breath, that he had always belonged to the Protestant Reformed Church of this country established by law. In 1723, Bishop Atterbury, the leader of the High-church party, declared, in the House of Lords, that he had no love for Popery, and that he held by the Protestant Reformed Church of his country. Now if this be so, if the Articles are Protestant, if the Homilies are Protestant, and if the leaders of the High-church School were Protestant, we may still assume that our Church *is* a Protestant Church.

Convocation, too, has on several occasions designated our Church “Protestant.”

Let me remind you, as I conclude, of what took place on the day that our gracious Majesty the Queen was crowned in Westminster Abbey. She was required to take certain oaths; and by whom were those oaths administered? They were administered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the name of this Church and nation; and one of the questions addressed to Her Majesty was this:—“Will you to the utmost of your powers maintain the laws of God, the true principles of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law?”

Seeing, then, that in all essential points touching Evangelical truth, we are in agreement with the framers of the formularies of the Church of England—sincerely attached to her form of Church government—cordially embracing her doctrinal standards, accepting her Scriptural liturgy—our doctrine and practice having been vindicated by the decisions of the highest courts of the realm; and believing her to be the great bulwark of our nation's Protestantism, we claim as Evangelical churchmen to be true churchmen.”